

E 112

.B98

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00008378046

B98

(16)

PORTRAITS OF COLUMBUS

by

JAMES DAVIE BUTLER

In Lippincott's Magazine

March 1883.

life!" he said. "You never can. The sum of a man's suffering does not equal an hour of the torture that the mind of a woman such as this one can inflict upon herself. Here is the trouble. The right side is fairly crushed. How under heaven did she ever get up here?"

Farrington looked at her, winced, and turned away: "Will you call some of the people? I must go out."

He went through the hall, out into the night. Mrs. West saw him go, and fell back in her chair, quivering.

The requirements of her imagination were momentarily satisfied, for she felt that the mystery of the fiddler of Batiscan had culminated in storm and tragedy.

Almost a year had passed since the wreck on St. Ignace.

Again the St. Lawrence steamer neared the wharf at Batiscan.

Dr. and Mrs. West leaned over the side-rail. Beside them stood Farrington and a handsome young woman with a slightly scornful upper lip.

Mrs. West had for some time been talking to this young woman in a rapid undertone. She had timed her remarks so nicely that as the first rope was cast to the shore she concluded, "I suppose, Eleanor, that Ned, and Paul too, would be indignant with me for telling you. But it was all so satisfactorily dreadful, and it is before me so vividly to-night, that I had to talk about it. And I told Paul, from the first, that she was abnormally depraved."

Eleanor had not interrupted or commented on her sister's dramatic recital. Now she said clearly, "Ned told me be-

fore I married him, all,—all. I said then that my sympathy was with her. I say so now. How can you or I realize her temptations or estimate her suffering?"

Close beside the wharf lay the *Bonne Marie*, her rigging ablaze with lights, and flags flying from every spar.

All Batiscan was on the wharf, for it was known that *Monsieur le Capitaine* was coming with his wife *en route* to St. Ignace.

Trembling through the night air came the notes of a violin; louder rose a lusty chorus,—

"Vive la belle! Vive la belle!
Voilà les beaux yeux."

Loudest of all, the clang of the gong, and the cry,—

"Batiscan! Batiscan! Stop half an hour at Batiscan."

When the steamer swung off, only Dr. and Mrs. West stood on the deck.

Mrs. West said pensively, "Life has no interest now that Eleanor has a husband. She is lovely, but just a little queer. Do you think everything will be all right?"

"The monotony of life, my dear," said West, "would be unendurable if, in your loose phraseology, 'everything ever were all right.' I think, though, that as a match-maker you are unrivalled. I am sure that, out of sympathy for my brother man, I hope you are alone of your kind. I think, too, that Eleanor, with what you call her 'queerness,'—I call it 'intellectual balance,'—is just the woman to love and to hold our Fiddler of Batiscan."

ANNIE ROBERTSON MACFARLANE.

PORTRAITS OF COLUMBUS.

WHEN Jefferson was the American minister in Paris, about 1784, he engaged an artist to make the best copy possible of what passed for the most authentic likeness of Columbus in existence, the Medici portrait in Florence. This painting was with Jefferson during his Presidency, and he writes about it as one of his chief jewels at Monticello in 1814. In his drawing-room there it hung the second among four portraits on the left as one entered. If Virginia had had any Historical Society in his time,* he would, no doubt, have delighted to enshrine his pictorial memorial within its walls, deeming it, as he wrote, "a matter even of some public concern that our country should not be without the portrait of its discoverer."

What has become of this Jeffersonian relic? is a question we naturally ask. I have corresponded regarding it with Mr. Lossing, who has illustrated so many of our worthies, and with Mr. Parton, the latest biographer of Jefferson. Neither of them could give me any inkling of its fate. I next wrote to Miss Sarah N. Randolph, a grand-daughter of Jefferson, and author of a volume on his "Domestic Life."

In her answer were these words: "The Columbus and other portraits, having been reserved at the sale of Mr. Jefferson's effects, were sent to Boston, where it was supposed there would be a better chance of selling them to advantage. They were intrusted to Mr. Coolidge, who married my aunt. They are both now dead, and I wrote to their daughter, telling her of your desire to know about the Columbus. She writes that she knows nothing of it, and would not know that such a picture had been at Monticello, but for the fact that it is mentioned in my book." "I have often," Miss Randolph continued, "wished to

trace this picture up, but suppose there is now no hope of doing so. My uncle has been dead only three years, and a single word from him would have told all." The word "Boston" in Miss Randolph's letter put me on the track. Had I been in that city I would have gone at once to the building of the Massachusetts Historical Society. But I was a thousand miles away; and so I scrutinized the publications of the society till I came to a notice of a portrait of Columbus presented by Israel Thorndike, and I observed that the donor in his letter of presentation (November 26, 1835) described it as "a copy from an original in the gallery of Medicis [*sic*] at Florence, for Thomas Jefferson." It was a pleasure to ascertain that the picture hangs in the hall of that society which has done most to elucidate the annals of the country over which Jefferson presided, and of the continent which Columbus revealed.

In 1814 Mr. Delaplaine was publishing in Philadelphia his "Repository of Distinguished Americans." He made strenuous efforts to obtain for his frontispiece a drawing from the Jeffersonian portrait. Failing in this endeavor, he was forced to have recourse to a painting by Macella, copied from some fancy portrait cased in plate-armor and frilled ruffs, with features as divergent as the costume from the genuine type.

The oldest portrait of Columbus of which I have discovered any trace in the United States now hangs in the New York Senate-Chamber at Albany. It was presented to the State in 1784 by Mrs. Maria Farmer, a grand-daughter of Jacob Leisler, Governor of New York in 1689. According to her statement, the painting had already been in her family for a hundred and fifty years. It may, then, have been brought from Europe more than two centuries ago. In one corner it bears the inscription "Anno 1592. Act. 23." This legend

* The Virginia Historical Society was not founded until five years after Jefferson's death, or in 1831.

may indicate the year in which the copy was taken, and the age of the copyist.

The so-called likenesses of Columbus are mostly fancy sketches. The great navigator, as represented at Madrid in the palace of the Duke of Berwick-Alba, is seated on a throne and arrayed in high-colored silks and embroidery. This painting is said to be a copy from a mythical likeness in Havana, which has been often sought for, but always in vain. It is the original of the largest known engraving, which bears this inscription: "The original was painted in America by Van Loo." (*El cuadro original fué pintado en América por Van Loo.*) When was Van Loo in America? The gods, one would think, must annihilate both time and space to make the owner of such a sham happy. Yet a copy of this engraving was highly prized by the late Mr. Lenox, and now adorns his library in the New York Central Park. He supposed that the original was painted in the lifetime of Columbus. In the Cuban Consistorial Hall, at Havana, Columbus appears dressed as a familiar of the Inquisition. In one likeness he resembles an effeminate Narcissus; in many others the costume and arrangement of hair are in a style unknown to his century, while his lineaments are treated with no less license than his vestments. Seeing Columbus thus transformed,—or rather deformed,—we are reminded of personal caricatures in *Punch*, and of an Innocent Abroad asking, "Is he dead?" or of a heathen idol baptized with the name of a saint, so that what was carved for Jupiter becomes Jew Peter.

More than one canvas passing for a portrait of Columbus is a palimpsest; that is, it shows traces of a former name having been erased in order that the word Columbus might be inscribed.

About thirty years ago, Mr. Barton, a member of the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts, seeing in the picture-gallery at Naples a portrait by Parmigiano which was called Columbus, obtained a copy of it painted by an Italian artist named Scardino, and gave it to the society for

hanging in its hall. Even in the view of its donor, this painting was only an ideal likeness of Columbus. According to Professor C. E. Norton, of Cambridge, "it is no longer held by any competent critic to be an authentic likeness." The disproof of its pretensions by the Spanish investigator and painter Carderera is in substance as follows: "We now come to notice the famous portrait which hangs in the Royal *Musco Borbonico* at Naples, attributed to the elegant pencil of *Parmegianino*. As this celebrated painting has of late misled very respectable persons, and has been reproduced in engravings at Naples, as well as in France and England,* it seems necessary to subject it to a careful analysis. Bechi, who has described this beautiful work, confesses that the eminent artist had to paint the portrait from imagination. M. Jomard, of the French National Library, is of the same opinion, and yet advised the Genoese nobles commissioned to raise a statue of the great man that their artists should inspire themselves at this notable painting. We must in many points differ from the opinions of the two distinguished persons we have just mentioned. Having carefully examined the portrait in Naples, we have come to doubt whether the Parmesan artist intended it to be a likeness of Columbus at all. There is scarcely any point of resemblance between the authentic [word-?] portraits of the admiral, which so clearly reveal the frank manner, and a certain courtier-like delicacy and reserve which appear in the Neapolitan canvas.

"Still more noticeable is the contrast between the garb and the austere aspect of our hero, and the exquisite and effeminate decorations of a personage whose physiognomy, very long and lean, differs most widely from the oval and strongly-marked face of the admiral,—an aspect noble, clear, and lit up by genius. Neither the hair which adorns the tem-

* This Neapolitan likeness appeared in Prescott's "Ferdinand and Isabella." It has just been engraved by George E. Perine expressly for the *American Eclectic Magazine*. It was an odd blunder to make a misnomer the subject of so fine an engraving.

ples of the Neapolitan figure with symmetrical and elegant locks, nor the whiskers and long beard, nor the curls smoothly arranged, were seen, save in rarest exceptions, in the age of Ferdinand and Isabella, either in Spain or in Italy or in other civilized regions of Europe; much less up to the first years of Charles V. could any one meet with a slashed German red cap with plume and gold studs. The same may be said concerning other parts of the attire,—as the silk sleeves hooped by fillets, lace about the hands, gloves, a finger-ring, and other refinements which characterize a finished gallant of the sixteenth century. It may be said that the medal which in the Neapolitan portrait adorns the cap bears a ship which is passing beyond the Pillars of Hercules. Admit that it does, may it not be only one of those devices then so much in vogue, and concerning which Giovio, Ruscelli, Capaccio, and other ingenious Italians wrote so many volumes? The vice-king of Catalonia bore as a device the sea-compass; Isabel of Correggio, two anchors in the sea. Stephen Colonna had two *columns* painted in the deep sea, with a band connecting them, and inscribed, *His suffulta*. We could cite a hundred examples of picture-restorers destroying accessories and legends, as well as injuriously cleansing and retouching. Who can satisfy us that the Neapolitan portrait has not suffered a similar degradation?"

On the whole, Carderera decides that Parmigiano's painting had no reference to Columbus, but was more probably a likeness of one Giberto de Sassuolo. It may be added that when Parmigiano had painted a Venus and then received a commission for a Virgin Mary, he passed off his queen of beauty, with some trifling changes, for the queen of saints. Nor were Venus and the Virgin more unlike each other than was his finical courtier to any fair setting forth of Columbus.

Equally untrustworthy has the portrait owned by the Duke of Veragua, a descendant of the great admiral, now been proved. Regarding this work, an

eminent Spanish artist says,* "Its date cannot be earlier than the end of the seventeenth century; it has whiskers and ruffles, which were unknown for more than one generation after Columbus. Nothing more than a copy of this modern fancy is to be seen in the Archives of the Indies at Seville, or in the celebrated engraving published by Muños." A copy of the Veragua portrait was presented in 1818 to the Pennsylvania Academy of Arts by R. W. Meade. In the light of subsequent criticism it turns out a less valuable benefaction than was supposed alike by the donor and by the receivers.

No less unsatisfactory is the bust in possession of the New York Historical Society. It is a fac-simile of an ideal in the Protomotica of the Capitoline Museum at Rome.

In view of such "counterfeit presentments" that were counterfeits indeed, and dissatisfied with Peschiera's ideal bust of 1821 in Genoa, the authorities of that city, wishing to erect a worthy monument of its greatest son, sought all through the world for his most authentic likeness, in order to show forth in its chief place of concourse the man himself, and not a mockery of him. The results of this research are worthy our notice.

The Madrid Historical Society advised the Genoese to model their statue, not according to any likeness in Spain, as national pride might have dictated, but by the Florentine painting from which Jefferson's copy was made, as well as according to an ancient wood-cut and an engraving which had been derived from the same source with that painting. What was that source? It was the museum of Paolo Giovio, on the site of Pliny's villa, by the Lake of Como. About the middle of the sixteenth century Cristofano dell' Altissimo was despatched to this museum by the Duke of Tuscany to copy portraits. Vasari relates that that painter completed more than two hundred and eighty, and that they were arranged in the Florentine Museum. They hang there to this day:

* Carderera, pp. 8-22.

—Columbus is No. 397. But whether the face of Columbus was among those painted by Cristofano cannot be proved from Bohn's edition of Vasari, nor by any edition in any language in the Boston Athenæum or Public Library, for I have had them both searched. But all the names are chronicled in the Giunti edition of Vasari, and perhaps in that alone.

Despairing for a while of discovering the Giunti edition of Vasari, which was set down in Brunet's Bibliography as "rare and much sought for" half a century ago, and so of securing the testimony of the only competent and credible contemporary witness known to me regarding the origin of the Florentine Columbus, I was all the more delighted to gain the information I desired from Professor Norton, of Harvard University, who wrote me as follows: "I am glad to say that I happen to have the Giunti edition of Vasari. The list of portraits in the Museo of the Duke Cosimo occupies three pages and part of a fourth. It begins with condottieri, who are followed by kings and emperors; these by emperors of the Turks, and other heroes; these by 'heroic men,' of whom the first eight are—1. Alberto Duro; 2. Leonardo da Vinci; 3. Tiziano; 4. Michel Angelo Buonarroti; 5. Amerigo Vespucci; 6. *Colombo Genovese*; 7. Ferdinando Magellane; 8. Ferdinando Cortese." The Florentine Columbus, then, is not an original,—though Mr. Jefferson, as was not surprising in his day, had fallen into the mistaken idea that it was. He says, "The Columbus was taken for me from the original which is in the gallery of Florence. I say from an original, because it is well known that in collections of any note, and that of Florence is the first in the world, no copy is ever admitted, and an original existing in Genoa would readily be obtained for a royal collection in Florence. Vasari names this portrait, but does not say by whom it was made."*

* The name "*Colombo Genovese*" has been at last discovered in one other edition of Vasari,—the Bologna of 1647. The finder, Judge Daly,

The Florentine Columbus cannot have been painted later than 1568, when Vasari's notice of it was printed. It may be a score of years older than that date. Though not an original, it is older than any other likeness can be proved, and probably older than any other claims to be. Its painter was sent to copy in the Giovian Museum, because there was the best portrait-gallery then in existence. Giovio had long lavished labor and lucre alike in forming it.

Before 1546 the Giovian Museum had become so famous that it drew things of like nature to itself. In that year Giulio Romano bequeathed to it a collection of portraits which Raphael had had made from stanzas in the Vatican.† Among these were Charles VII., King of France, Antonio Colonna, Prince of Salerno, Niccolo Fortebraccio, Francesco Carmignuola, Cardinal Bessarion, Francesco Spinola, and Battista da Canneto. As the place where works of art would be most carefully preserved, best shown, and most appreciated, that repository might well be considered the niche which such treasures were ordained to fill. Accordingly, it is not incredible that if any art-collector left no legacy to the Giovian reservoir his neglect was judged to be such a proof of insanity as to warrant breaking his will.

Ticozzi has published eight volumes, and Bottari various notices, proving Giovio's pains to secure authentic contemporary portraits. His letters to Duke Cosimo, to Doni, Aretino, Titian, and others, show solicitude lest some of his portraits were not faithful or worthy of faith.‡ He was twenty-three years old at the death of Columbus. He was one of the foremost to see the greatness of the discoverer. Some of his words concerning him were, "It seems that he is altogether worthy to be honored with a most splendid statue by the Genoese."§

describes it as hidden away in a corner,—that is, "in the Appendix to vol. iii., signature F. f. f., third sheet back."

† Vasari, vol. ii. p. 17.

‡ Carderera, p. 17.

§ "Sicut Columbus dignus videri possit qui a Liguribus lucentissima statua decoretur." In Christoph. Columbi Elogio.

While holding this view, and so careful regarding the accuracy of other likenesses, was he negligent regarding that of Columbus? His museum was situated in a Spanish province. His agents were abroad in Spain, perhaps so early that if no portrait existed they could have had one painted.

Besides, how unlikely, when other honors were showered upon Columbus, and Giovio counted him worthy of a statue, that no one was found to sketch his features, especially as he survived till Italian painters were common in Spain! One of the portraits painted from life, which were secured by Giovio, was, in the judgment of Crowe and Cavalcaselle, that of Mohammed II., by Gentile Bellini. Who will believe that Giovio was more anxious to obtain a truthful presentment of a Turk than of a countryman,—of the conqueror of an old city than of the discoverer of the New World?

The wood-cut which has been already alluded to was published at Basel in 1578 to illustrate a eulogy on Columbus and other celebrities, written by Giovio. According to its editor, Perna, that wood-cut was derived from a portrait in the Giovian Museum, which had been painted from life. His words are, "I have at much expense employed an eminent artist to engrave the Giovian portraits *painted from life*,"* and, so far as appears, no others than those painted from life.

The wood-cuts of some other notable in Giovio's book being known to be correct, it is a natural inference that that which represents Columbus is also worthy of credit. It is also asserted by Spanish critics that a family likeness to the Giovian type, as shown in the Florentine copy and in the wood-cut, is clear in most old and famous likenesses, as in the Belvedere at Vienna, the Borghese at Rome, the Altamira, the Malpica, the Villa Franca, etc., in Spain.†

The engraving in which Columbus

holds an octant in his hand was first published at Cologne by Crispin de Pas. When critically examined, it turns out to be nothing but a free imitation of the Giovian wood-cut which came out in Basel twenty years before.‡

The portraits I have last passed in review are the more reliable because they show the person of Columbus as we have it described by his own son, as well as by his contemporary Oviedo; that is, "face large and ruddy, cheek-bones rather high, nose aquiline, eyes light; hair blonde in youth, but at thirty years already white."§

In the list of Giovian portraits copied by Cristofano, Columbus stands between those of Americus and Magellan. He who disputes the authenticity of Columbus, if consistent, must push his scepticism further, unless the features of Americus and Magellan are confirmed by other evidence. If they are, they heighten the certainty that the Columbian likeness is likewise truthful.

The Swiss wood-cut of 1578 antedates all others, but it is poorly preserved.||

Accordingly, the Roman drawing by Capriolo, published in 1596, and the painting in Florence, were recommended by Spain to the Genoese as the best models in form and feature of the countryman whom they most delighted to honor. Thanks to these and perhaps other archetypes,¶ his native city

‡ Carderera, p. 18.

§ Neither the Florentine portrait nor the Giovian wood-cut, as I think, shows white hair, though both represent a man more than thirty years old. But in all ages artists have loved to depict their subjects as young in hair as in heart. Besides, who knows but Columbus dyed his hair?

¶ Boletín I., 3, 258.

¶ A letter from the United States Consul at Genoa states that the sculptors of the statue of Columbus in that city took as their model a drawing, furnished by the Duke of Veragna, from the Cancellieri portrait, which was copied from one found at Cuccaro in the house of a collateral branch of the Columbus family. Now, the Cuccaro likeness was long ago shown by Carderera to have come from the engraving by Capriolo, and this engraving, which dates from 1596, to have been taken from the Florentine portrait or from the Giovian original. It is itself followed, with slight variations, in the portrait which now hangs in the Naval Museum at

* "Ho mandado dibujar con mucho dispendio á un sobresaliente artista los retratos pintados al vivo, que decoraban el Museo de Giovio."
† Carderera, p. 24.

in 1862 completed a monument to Columbus which puts to shame our ridiculous figure by the Neapolitan Persico perched on the Capitol steps at Washington in 1844, where he who gave us our continent is clad in a sort of mail not invented at his era, and, standing with the globe poised in his hand like a nine-pin ball, seems ready to bowl it through an alley.

Though so many portraits of Columbus point to that in Giovio's Museum as their origin, and bear a family likeness in scale, attitude, and material, and the eyes in all look to the right, they differ in accessories, especially in the costume and the hair, as well as in the expression, which ranges from sad to cheerful.

The wood-cut and the Florentine copy are so divergent in dress, though the features are alike, that recent critics hold that Giovio had two likenesses. The costume in the wood-cut corresponds to what the curate of Palacios saw Columbus wearing in June, 1496,—namely, “a dress in color and fashion like a Franciscan friar's, but shorter, and for devotion girt with the rope of a Cordelier.”* The costume in the Giovian portrait strikes men now exactly as the actual garb of Columbus struck the Spanish curate. While a life-size copy of it was being framed in an American town, every one who came into the shop said to the workman, “What Catholic priest have you here?” In the era of Columbus it was a popular faith that no one was sure of salvation unless he died in a religious dress. The religiosity of Columbus was as great as that of any man

Who, to be sure of para dise,
Dying put on the weeds of Dominic,
Or in Franciscan thought to pass disguised.

But, as a sailor's garments were then like a Franciscan's, some hold that Columbus

Madrid. One copy of this last picture has been procured by Chief-Justice Daly for the American Geographical Society in New York, and another has just been presented by Hon. Hannibal Hamlin to Colby University in Maine.

* “Vino el Almirante en Castilla en el mes de junio de 1496, vestido de unas ropas de color de hábito de San Francisco de observancia, é en la hechura poco menos que hábito, y con cordon de San Francisco por devocion.” Carderera, p. 19.

chose to be so painted with allusion to his achievements as a mariner.

The genuineness of the Giovian portrait is argued from its dress being similar to the Franciscan friar's frock. A portrait in such a costume, it is maintained, would never have been admitted among those of Americus, Magellan, Cortez, and other military heroes unless known to be either an original or copied from one that was indubitably drawn from life. The dress also points to a Spanish origin, because Italian artists already insisted on tricking out portraits even of contemporaries in the robes of ancient Romans, as Malone improved the bust above Shakespeare's tomb by white-washing it all over.

One point in the investigation—namely, what has become of the one or more most ancient portraits which adorned the museum of Giovio—has been strangely neglected. Carderera states that the collection was divided between the families of two Giovian counts, the descendants of whom still reside in Como. Something of it certainly remained in 1780, when a letter from Giambattista Giovio to Tiraboschi described its relics, which, according to Crowe and Cavalcaselle, continued undispersed to the very close of the eighteenth century. It is possible, then, that a search about Como might be rewarded by the discovery of a portrait of Columbus, which would, as being unique, become as famous in its line as the Vatican Codex is among Biblical manuscripts, or even as pre-eminent as that Codex would stand if the Alexandrian and Sinaitic Codices had never existed.

There was one picture brought out in 1595 with two warts on the left cheek and a full-bottomed wig, by Theodore Bry, a Dutch engraver, who called it Columbus and claimed that the original had been executed by order of the Spanish monarchs when Columbus was about starting on his first voyage. At that early period, however, those sovereigns were so far from caring for his portrait that they shipped him off to get rid of his presence, which was as

vexatious to them as the importunate widow to the unjust judge. Besides, in this painting the physiognomy is totally unlike the delineations by the discoverer's intimates. The nose, for instance, was flat and snub,—not aquiline. This mercantile speculation—for it was nothing else—is a Dutch face, and looks as if a Dutchman made it. It is inscribed *Indiarum primus inventor*. Its pretensions have been exploded by Navarrete.

In 1763 a portrait of Columbus, with those of Cortez, Lope, and Quevedo, was purchased by the Spanish government from N. Yañez,* who had brought it from Granada. There is no indication that any likeness of the discoverer had existed at an earlier period in the royal picture-gallery. The Yañez portrait was hung in the National Library, and confessed by art critics to resemble closely in features that in the Florentine Uffizi, the oldest of known date, and that from which Jefferson's copy was taken. It was highly praised by Navarrete in his great work, which is a nobler monument to Columbus than the labor of an age in piled stones.

But Spanish artists were long ago satisfied that the Yañez portrait had been tampered with by some audacious restorer, and they at length obtained permission to test it with chemicals.† From side to side of the upper margin of the picture there ran the legend, "Christof. Columbus nori [*sic*] orbis inventor." These words were first subjected to the artists' test, and, as they vanished, another inscription came out beneath them,—namely, the words "Columb Lygur novi orbis rector [*sic*]." The variations not only proved that the likeness had been repainted, but that the second painter was inferior to the first, since *reptor* means one who finds by searching, which *inventor* does not.

* Boletin I., No. 3, p. 267.

† Boletin I., No. 4, p. 327.

The testers had no hesitation about proceeding further. The flowing robe with a heavy fur collar, "more befitting," as they said, "a Muscovite than a mariner," vanished, while a simple garb—only a closely-fitting tunic and a mantle folded across the breast—rose to view. The eyes, nose, lower lip, facial oval, all assumed a new expression. The air of sadness vanished. Señor Cabello and his assistants, who had begun their work nervously, finished it with glad surprise when they beheld the great discoverer throwing off his disguise and emancipated,

As if he whom the asp
In his marble grasp
Kept close and for ages strangled,
Got loose from the hold
Of each serpent fold,
And exulted, disentangled.

A copy of this resuscitated Columbus was procured by General Fairchild while minister to Spain, and has been presented by him to the Historical Society of Wisconsin, which has its local habitation in that capitol where he has served as chief magistrate of the State longer than any other man.

We may well feel the more interest in the portraits of Columbus, since it is still disputed, and perhaps doubtful, where the ashes of the great voyager now repose. It is claimed in Cuba that his remains were transported to that island in 1796, while the St. Domingans assert that they then with pious fraud delivered up only sham relics, but retained and secreted the veritable treasure.‡ However this may be, and though every bone of Columbus must turn to dust and the world shall have no hair of him for memory, thanks to Giovinetti and his artists, we may believe that his face, his form, his habit as he lived, still triumph over death.

JAMES DAVIE BUTLER.

‡ Los Restos de Colon. Madrid, 1879.

H 41
73521



B50 77



N MANCHESTER,
INDIANA

